EVOLUTION AT THE BAR

PHILIP MAURO

213

Frank Cunningham
Falls City, Oregon

Purchased at Turner
Convention
July 5, 1923.

Dan R. Lawson

EVOLUTION AT THE BAR

PHILIP MAURO

Books by PHILIP MAURO

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN
"AFTER THIS"
GOD'S PRESENT KINGDOM
BRINGING BACK THE KING
A KINGDOM WHICH CANNOT BE SHAKEN
RUTH, THE SATISFIED STRANGER
OUR LIBERTY IN CHRIST
THE NUMBER OF MAN, OR
THE CLIMAX OF CIVILIZATION
GOD'S PILGRIMS, THEIR DANGERS,
THEIR RESOURCES, THEIR REWARDS
GOD'S APOSTLE AND HIGH PRIEST
GOD'S GOSPEL AND GOD'S RIGHTEOUSNESS
GOD'S GIFT AND OUR RESPONSE
GOD'S LOVE AND GOD'S CHILDREN
LIFE IN THE WORLD
THE WORLD AND ITS GOD
"LOOKING FOR THE SAVIOUR"
BAPTISM AND THE NEW COVENANT

EVOLUTION AT THE BAR

BY

PHILIP MAURO

"Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?"—I Cor. 1.20

NEW YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

COPYRIGHT, 1922,
BY HAMILTON BROS.

EVOLUTION AT THE BAR. III

Printed in the United States of America

FOREWORD

The writer of this article was for upwards of twenty years a believer in and student of the philosophy of materialism; but after his conversion to faith in Jesus Christ he rejected it *in toto*, first because it was found to be contrary to the Scriptures, and second, because, upon careful investigation, it was also found to be opposed to every pertinent fact of history and natural science.

As regards "evidence" in support of the theory there is none that would be admitted in any court of law. It rests wholly upon unprovable assumptions, and upon highly speculative and far-fetched inferences. The evidence against it is abundant and convincing; and while the subject is so vast and complex that we can present, in an article like this, only a small part of the counterproof, yet we can give *all that is needed* in order to show that the theory is not only unsupported by proof, but is opposed both to the facts of science and to statements of Holy Scripture.

Our design, in writing these pages (originally prepared for use in the compilation of a Bible Cyclopedia by the Bible Union of China) was to set forth the main features of the theory of Evolution in such a way as to make it easy to be understood by the unlearned. The exponents of science and philosophy usually adopt a style and vocabulary which effectually hide their meaning from "the common people," and which are well calculated to produce the impression that the subjects they discuss are too mysterious and profound to be understood by any but the few who (like themselves) are gifted with intellects of a superior order, and possessed of knowledge unattainable by the ordinary man.

But the truth is that—when we disregard mere re-

finements of detail, and technicalities of a non-essential character—the doctrine of Evolution in general, and that of the Origin of Species (the Darwinian hypothesis) in particular, can be set forth "in words easy to be understood," and can be understood by persons of ordinary intelligence and of common school education. And furthermore, the scientist and philosopher have no *facts* upon which to base their conclusions except such as are matters of common knowledge, or are accessible to all men through textbooks and cyclopedias. We fully concede to experts their special competence in investigating, clarifying, and setting forth the facts; but, in the all important matter of *drawing conclusions from those facts,* the expert has no greater ability than the ordinary persons, of whom juries—which in common-law cases are *the sole judges of the facts*—are composed. It is for the benefit of these that we are now writing; and in summoning Evolution to stand trial at the bar of ordinary common sense, our own function will be mainly to present the pertinent facts as fully and concisely as possible.

As regards the reasons commonly advanced in support of the doctrine of Evolution it is one of the most palpable weaknesses of the case that the alleged "evidences" for it have to be sought in the darkest corners of creation and in the remotest regions of time and space; and further that, when brought into the light of honest inquiry, they cannot be recognized, by ordinary persons, as having any relation at all to the doctrine they are cited to sustain. For Evolution is set forth as a *cosmic* process—that is, a law operating *always* and *everywhere.* It is either that or nothing. But, if so, then the evidences of it would be *always* and *everywhere* apparent. Whichever way we might look they would force themselves upon our notice, in countless numbers and endless varieties of forms. The proofs would be so abundant that the demon-

strator of the doctrine would never get to the end of them; whereas, as the case actually stands, the efforts and the ingenuity of the evolutionist are mainly occupied in *trying to account with plausibility for the total lack of evidence in nature for the support of his doctrine.*

Another thing which must impress every fair-minded investigator of this modern theory is the fallacious character of the *reasoning* often employed by its advocates. Take the case of the now extinct varieties of horse having three and four toes. Appeal is often made to the remains of those creatures as if they proved the whole case of Evolution; whereas they do not even prove that the existing varieties of the equine species were derived from those extinct forms. There is nothing whatever to forbid the idea that the present varieties of the species existed *at the same time* with those now extinct forms. Proof of connection between them, and of derivation of the one from the other, is wholly lacking. But even if such connection were established, it would not tend in the least to prove the evolution of one *species* from another, which is the matter in dispute. That many *varieties* of a common species can be produced is a fact so abundantly in evidence in both vegetable and animal kingdoms as to create a strong presumption that, *if it were possible to cross the boundary lines of a species, there would be abundant evidence of that also.* But the fact is that, with all nature under observation, and with the plain records of the fossiliferous rocks, *not one transitional form* to help bridge the gulf between one species and another has ever been found. The four-toed horse is as much a "horse" as the one-toed variety. And Mr. Darwin was himself compelled to concede all that we here point out. He said (*Life and Letters, Vol. III. p.* 25): "There are *two or three million of species* on earth—sufficient field, one might think, for observation. But it must be said today that,

in spite of all the efforts of trained observers, *not one change of a species into another is on record.*" This statement can be made with even greater confidence now, after a lapse of over half a century since Mr. Darwin made the above admission.

It is vain, therefore, for the evolutionist to think he can ride upon the four-toed horse to a successful demonstration of his theory.

The Wisdom of This World

The doctrine of Evolution is doubtless the culminating effort and fruit of "the wisdom of this world"; and our thought about it is that God will make use of it to exhibit the utter "foolishness" of human wisdom. Never has there been a cosmic philosophy set forth with such pretentiousness, or backed with such authority by "Science"; and never has there been a doctrine so audaciously proclaimed in direct and defiant opposition to the truth of Creation, revealed in the Holy Scriptures. Therefore the theory of Evolution is pre-eminently suited to exemplify the Scripture, "*Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?*" (1 Cor. 1:20.)

Framingham, Mass.
April, 1922.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION

Except for the addition of a single paragraph, the first complete paragraph on page 76, the text of the first edition is followed in this second printing.

CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD v

CHAPTER I 11

The Theory Defined

Cosmic Evolution

Organic Evolution

CHAPTER II 17

Breaks in the Continuity

The Origin of Life

Other Origins

Permanence of Species

Development of Varieties

Reproduction

CHAPTER III 27

"Science" as an Authority

Reasons Given in Support of Evolution

Embryology

Succession of Species

Species Appeared Suddenly

Great Gaps between Species Existed from the First

The Fragmentary Character of the Geological Record

CHAPTER IV 38

Specific Objections to Evolution:

The Wings of Fowls

The Bat and the Mole

The Water Spider

Organs and Instincts: The Beehive, The Beaver

CHAPTER V 52
The Origin of Man
Distinguishing Characteristics of Man
"Missing Links"
Ancient Human Remains—Scientific Authorities Quoted

CHAPTER VI 58
Theistic Evolution
Evolution and Christianity
The Law and the Gospel not Evolved
Evolution and Christ

CHAPTER VII 67
Estimates of Darwinism
Darwinism Rejected by Men of Science
The Existing Danger
Darwinism in the Schools

CHAPTER VIII 73
Evolution in Human Affairs
Evidences of Evolution in all Human Activities
Mr. Wallace on Human "Progress"
The Spread of the Theory Accounted For
The "Fatal Bias"
"The Law of Sin and Death"

EVOLUTION AT THE BAR

CHAPTER I

The Theory Defined "Evolution" is a philosophical and speculative theory, of recent origin, whereby it is sought to account for the various elements and compounds of the *inorganic* world, and also for the countless species of living creatures in the *organic* world.

By the "inorganic world" is meant the elements and compounds, as minerals and gases, which are without life; and by the "organic world" is meant organisms (plants and animals) which have life.

Although sometimes spoken of as a "scientific" theory, Evolution is not scientific; for science has to do only with *facts.* Evolution belongs wholly in the realm of *speculative philosophy.*

The basic assumption of this theory is that all things in nature—living and not living—had a *common origin;* and that all the diverse elements, compounds, and organisms were developed by the cumulative effect of changes, in themselves imperceptibly small, all of which changes were brought about by the energy of "forces resident in nature."

The theory assumes *the existence* of Matter and Force, without attempting to account for *the origin* of either. Matter is supposed to have existed originally in a perfectly simple and undifferentiated condition. Its form is supposed to have been that of an exceedingly tenuous, highly heated mist or vapor, filling all space. Force is also assumed to have been exceedingly simple at the first, being nothing more than a ten-

dency on the part of the entire mass of undifferentiated Matter to keep in motion. As to where Matter came from, and Force, and the tremendous uniform Heat, necessary to keep Matter in a gaseous state, the theory is silent.

The theory further assumes that, at some time, and for some unexplained reason, the motion of the particles of matter began to take *different directions*, and also that, by the radiation of the heat of parts of the mass, liquefaction and ultimately solidification resulted. Where the heat so radiated could have gone—seeing that all parts of infinite space were supposedly *heated alike*—is not explained; nor how, in a perfectly *uniform* mass, parts could assume a permanently *solid* form, and other parts a normally *liquid* form, while other parts *remained normally gaseous.* Upon the theory of Cosmic Evolution all gases and liquids should long ago have evolved into solids.

These great changes in Matter are supposed to have been accompanied by equally notable changes in Force. Differences of "Environment" having now arisen, of which differences the theory has no explanation, the effects of Force or Energy would be influenced thereby, in such wise as to produce diversities of forms, until, by the continuous operation of those processes, with ever increasing ramifications and complexities, the infinite varieties of creatures, animate and inanimate, which now compose the universe, came to be what they are.

Such are the words by which the theory of Evolution is set forth; but the only clear thing about them is that they do not explain the origin of the universe or of any of its parts.

Other principles are called to the aid of Evolution at different stages of the cosmic process; *e. g.* Heredity, Environment, Natural Selection, Struggle for Existence, Survival of the Fittest, Transmission of Acquired Characters, etc. With these auxiliary factors

we have but little concern, our object being to inquire *what, if any, foundation in fact there is for the basic theory.* If that falls, the auxiliary factors must of necessity fall with it.

According to Mr. Herbert Spencer, the leading exponent of the theory, evolutionary changes are of three principal sorts: (1) a change from a less coherent to a more coherent state; (2) a change from a more homogeneous to a less homogeneous state; (3) a change from a less definite to a more definite state.

Le Conte defines Evolution as "(1) continuous progressive change, (2) according to fixed laws, (3) by means of *resident* forces."

It is important to note the expression "resident forces," which excludes the idea of a Creator acting in or upon the universe.

Such is the theory in its broad outlines; and it is evident that thus far it is wholly imaginative and speculative, every essential feature being assumed without a particle of proof. Indeed it may be clearly seen that the theory is self-contradictory, as in assuming that (under the supposed conditions) latent heat could discharge so as to permit concentration to take place, when there were *no cooler regions* into which it *could* discharge.

Further it is self-evident that the action of Infinite Wisdom and Power would be as much needed for the creation of the supposed Matter and Force, with their supposed capacity for development and diversification, as for the creation of separate elements, compounds, and living species. In fact both Darwin and his co-laborer Wallace had to admit that it was necessary to concede, at various points in the supposed evolution of the world, as well as at the starting point, the working of an outside power, a power not resident in matter. From this admission it follows that there is nothing "unscientific" in the doctrine of Creation by an intelligent Creator.

"Cosmic" and "Organic" Evolution

Nature is seen to exist in two great departments, one comprising things having life, the other things not having life. The former is the "organic" department of nature, the latter the "inorganic." Between these two departments is an impassable gulf. Evolutionists have to concede this; for as Mr. Huxley said, "The present state of knowledge furnishes us with *no link* between the living and the not-living."

This is a fatal admission; for assuredly, if the entire organic kingdom emerged out of the inorganic, there would be innumerable "links" between the two. It is simply impossible that all traces of such a stupendous transformation should have been obliterated.

To accommodate the theory to this state of the division of nature, Evolution has been correspondingly divided into "Organic Evolution" and "Inorganic" or "Cosmic Evolution.' Thus we have, at present, two distinct Evolutions, each rigidly confined to its own department of nature. The original Evolution, which evolved living creatures out of inanimate matter, *no longer exists.* It has gone entirely out of business, and has ceased to exist from the time, whenever it was, that the world of living creatures was separated, by an impassable barrier, from the not-living. It would follow that Evolution is not what it once was. Having once crossed the line which separates the living from the not-living it has lost the power to do so again.

Cosmic Evolution

Cosmic Evolution, or Evolution as it is supposed to operate in the universe at large—the starry heavens, the earth and sea and air—calls for but brief notice in this article. Proof of the existence, either now or in past ages, of any such "law" as that of Evolution, is altogether lacking. Suffice it, therefore, to say that if, anywhere in the universe, at any stage of its existence, undif-

ferentiated matter has been gradually transformed by means of resident forces, into the various substances of earth, sea, and sky, with their widely different and often antagonistic properties, there has never been discovered by mortal man the shadow of a shade of a proof thereof. The results of all investigations that have been made up to the present hour bear accordant witness to the fact that *stability* of forms and of the properties of inorganic substances, is the fixed rule of nature. Those who accept the idea of Cosmic Evolution must needs do so without any evidence whatever to support it, for none exists.

Organic Evolution How then stands the case with respect to "Organic Evolution"? Is it any better supported than "Cosmic Evolution"? In this field it will be necessary to make a closer examination of facts and phenomena; for living creatures *do* undergo changes. In fact their existence is one of *continuous* change.

What characterizes the organic department of nature is the existence of *individuals,* each living an independent life of its own, and each having its own life-history. Each of these individual organisms comes *suddenly* into being; it goes through various stages of growth until maturity is reached; it reproduces its kind; it declines and *suddenly* ceases to exist. This is what we find throughout the entire organic field. But there is nothing in the inorganic department of nature which even remotely resembles this *life-story of individuals.* That field will be searched in vain for anything out of which the details of the organic world, comprising several millions of species, each with an infinitude of structural and other peculiarities, could conceivably have been evolved. Yet, the theory of Evolution, as an universal or cosmic process, requires us to believe that the entire organic world emerged, at some past era, from the inorganic.

Surely, if such were indeed the case, then the latter would contain abundant evidences thereof, showing how individual entities, with their characteristic life-changes, came into existence. And not only so, but we should also find everywhere inorganic groupings of atoms gradually reaching forth towards organic existence; and most certainly it would be possible by laboratory methods to transform the one into the other.

Due notice should also be taken of the striking fact that the beginning of the existence of each living creature is *sudden,* that its term of life is *short,* and that its changes are *rapid.* Whereas Evolution requires a *very gradual* coming into existence, exceedingly *long* histories, and changes of prodigious *slowness.* The fact then is that, in the field of the living, as in that of the not-living, there is no evidence whatever in support of evolution; but on the contrary every fact and phenomenon cognizable by the senses strongly contradicts that theory. This will become more and more apparent as we proceed.

CHAPTER II

Breaks in the Continuity

As we trace in imagination the supposed course of evolution from its assumed beginning in undifferentiated matter onward and upward to the infinite diversities of the organic kingdom, we not only encounter difficulties at every step and in connection with every detail, but we also find certain *gaps,* deep and wide, for which evolutionists themselves can offer no definite explanation. The first and greatest of these is the gap between the living and the not-living. The entire world of living creatures is assumed to have emerged, sometime and somehow, and through "resident forces," out of the inorganic realm. Yet no trace of this marvellous process remains, and the inorganic world exhibits *no progressiveness at all,* no power or disposition to advance one hair's breadth.

The next gap is that between the vegetable and animal kingdoms. If the latter, in its entirety, arose out of the former through gradual and infinitesimal changes, no trace of that marvellous development remains; nor can there be found in the vegetable kingdom anything from which the characteristic features of animal life could be evolved.

Next we encounter the great gap between the vertebrates and the invertebrates; then that between the mammals and other vertebrates; then the gaps between each of the two million or so of distinct species of organisms and every other; and finally the immense gap between Man and the highest of the brutes.

In considering these great gaps, and the many lesser ones, it should be borne in mind that Evolution is set forth expressly as a theory of *origins,* that is to say,

as an explanation of how all the infinite varieties of things, living and not-living, *came into existence.* But origins, including those of the very broadest kind, are just what the theory conspicuously fails to explain. Thus, to begin with, the evolutionist makes no pretence that his theory can explain the origin of either Matter or Force. The existence of these he must take for granted, and attribute them to an Unknowable First Cause.

The Origin of Life Going on further we come to creatures having that mysterious thing called *Life.* Does Evolution account for the origin of that? Quite the contrary; Darwin himself declared that spontaneous generation is "absolutely inconceivable." His co-discoverer, Alfred Russel Wallace, says that "the *very first* vegetable cell must have possessed *altogether new powers";* and he adds, "Here we have indications of *a new power at work.*" Huxley admits that there is no evidence of any link between the living and the not-living; and other leading evolutionists could be quoted to the same effect. So, just where an explanation of the origin of a new and extraordinary thing is needed, Evolution—that great theory of origins—completely breaks down. Matter and force do not account for the origin of life. Therefore Darwin had to accept the truth of divine fiat to explain it. He seems, in accepting this truth, to seek, by the use of fine language, to disguise the fact that it is *fatal to his theory.* Note his words: "There is a grandeur in this view of Life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into the first forms or into one." If so, then is there not the same "grandeur" in the view of the direct action of the Creator in the origin of every substance and species? Mr. Darwin admits (because he must) that there is nothing "unscientific" in assuming the direct intervention of the Creator in originating *the first* liv-

ing forms; and if so there is nothing unscientific in assuming His intervention to create *all* living species.

The Origin of the Animal Kingdom Going still further, we come to *the animal kingdom,* whose species have powers (as locomotion, feelings, etc.) not possessed by the vegetable. What has Evolution to say as to the origin of that? Not a word. Here again Mr. Wallace admits that the advance from the vegetable to the animal kingdom is "completely beyond all possibility of explanation by *Matter,* its laws and forces. It is the introduction of *sensation or consciousness,* constituting the fundamental distinction between the animal and vegetable kingdoms."

Thus, in respect to the origins of the major divisions of nature, the theory of Evolution is a confessed failure. It cannot even pretend to account for them. This fact will be emphasized when we come to point out, later on, that the foremost evolutionists, including Spencer, Huxley and Romanes, before their death, utterly repudiated the Darwinian theory of the Origin of Species. It would be difficult or impossible to find a naturalist of the first rank who would support that theory today. Haeckel alone, of the older naturalists, stood for its defense; and he was utterly discredited because of his audacious and unscrupulous conduct in forging evidences to support the theory. But we would at this point ask, what is the value of, and what credence should be given to, a Theory of Origins which admittedly is unable to account for the origin of Matter, Force, Life, the Animal Kingdom, and the Species?

Other Origins Passing on, in our general survey of nature, and without further reference at present to the Origin of Species (of which we have more to say later), we come to the *Vertebrates,* that is

to say, that large and superior order of living creatures which have a back-bone. Does Evolution give us any explanation of that? None whatever. While the difference between the vertebrates and invertebrates is not so conspicuous and notable as that between the living and not-living, or that between the vegetable and animal kingdom, yet Evolution is just as impotent to explain the one as the other. There is not the slightest evidence to show that creatures having no back-bone "evolved" the many species of vertebrates, nor is there even a plausible suggestion as to how such a thing could be brought to pass.

Looking further, we come to the large and important class of *Mammals,* that is to say, species whereof the female imparts nourishment to its young from the breast. Certain species of vertebrates—the birds, reptiles and fishes—have not this peculiarity, nor anything approaching it. These, however, are far inferior to those creatures which have the nourishing breast. So we ask again the question: Does Evolution account for it? And again the answer must be in the negative. There is no connecting link between the two classes; nor are there any groups of non-mammals that are reaching out to enter the great class of Mammalia.

We would at this point dispose of an unwarranted inference which is often urged (in the total absence of *proofs*) in support of the theory of Evolution. That inference is that because there are many species which have features in common—as back-bones, and nourishing breasts—those species must have had a common origin. That is to say, resemblances are supposed to point to an ancestor common to all. But the inference is without warrant. Such resemblances are just as consistent with the dogma of Creation as with the theory of Evolution. Resemblances are to be expected in the works of an all-wise Creator. For when He has devised a contrivance, as a back-bone, to serve

a certain purpose, He would inevitably use the same device in whatever place that purpose was to be served, with only such modifications and adaptations as the varying needs of individual species might require.

We need not continue any further, for our present purpose, our general survey of the field of the organic kingdoms of nature. We deem it sufficient under this heading to say that, in not one of these orders and species, and in not one of the countless billions of organisms comprised in them, has there ever been seen the slightest tendency *to advance, or to depart from its type.* On the contrary, there is found in every living creature the most stubborn and unconquerable determination *not* to evolve. The whole universe, therefore, and every member of it, is a witness against Evolution.

Furthermore, if Evolution were the law of progress of the universe, it is manifest that there would be *no species or other lines of division.* There would be only *individual forms,* shading imperceptibly one into another, each in the process of becoming something else, so that classification would be an impossibility. The world that lies before us, composed of clearly marked divisions, orders, classes, species, all sharply defined and separated one from another by impassable barriers, is *just the opposite* of such a world as the supposed law of Evolution would produce. We can, therefore, summon heaven and earth, land and sea, and all the hosts of them to bear witness, that Evolution is a myth.

Permanence of the Species

The matter of the permanence of species deserves special consideration. It is admitted on all hands that there is no Evolution in the individual organism —but that the contrary rule holds everywhere. For the individual comes into being suddenly, matures

quickly, reproduces, and suddenly ceases to be. The evolutionist, however, claims that it is the *species,* not the individual organism, that has come into existence through Evolution. The *species,* says he, is governed by the "law" of Evolution, though (strange to say) *the individuals* which compose the species are exempt from it.

There is, however, a serious and obvious flaw in the logic which would distinguish thus between the individual, and the species to which it belongs; for the species cannot exist apart from the individuals composing it, any more than a river can exist apart from its water. The species is merely an abstraction; and there is obviously no way a species can evolve, except by the evolving of *all* the individuals composing it. Strictly speaking, and for the purposes of a discussion like this, "species" do not exist. What exist in nature are simply innumerable *individuals* each having its own life. Individuals which have life of *the same sort* are said to constitute a "species." Therefore, evolutionary changes, if they take place at all, must needs begin and continue in *individuals.*

It follows that, if there be *no inherent tendency in individual organisms* to depart from their ancestral types, there could not be *any development of new species.* If, on the other hand, the immense number of existing species *did* come into their present state of being through evolutionary changes, effected by resident forces (as distinguished from the act of a Creator from without) then we should find *no distinct species of plants and animals,* but a very different state of things; for, instead of definite and persistent types, we should have a confusion of nondescript individuals, each in process of becoming something different from what its ancestors were.

Evolution assumes that all things in the organic world are endowed with two opposite and mutually antagonistic tendencies, *first* a tendency *to depart*

from its ancestral type under the influence of changes in "environment," and *second,* a tendency *to hold tightly* all its peculiarities, and to transmit them to its offspring. These two tendencies could not exist in the same creatures. The former is purely imaginary. It is contrary to all the observed facts of nature. For, so far from there being any tendency on the part of individuals to depart from the ancestral type, and so far from there being any evidence of "resident forces" in them, impelling them to do so, the fact is—always and everywhere—that individual organisms evince a most stubborn tendency to cling to the ancestral type, despite all influences to the contrary.

This important fact can be stated very strongly; for scientific men, like Luther Burbank, have sought by every conceivable means to develop new species. But, notwithstanding some remarkable results in the way of "varieties," it has been found (1) that the barrier of species *cannot be crossed,* (2) that every "variety" produced artificially, if left to itself for a few generations, reverts to the original type. In a word, what we find in each and all the thousands of species of living creatures is, perfect obedience to the primal law of their being, given to them by their Creator when He said, "Let the earth bring forth grass and herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit *after his kind* * * * and the living creature, *after his kind,* cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth, *after his kind;* and it was so" (Gen. 1:11, 24). It was "so" then; and beyond all question it is "so" now.

Here we see that Evolution comes into direct collision both with the facts of nature and with the statements of the Word of God.

Development of "Varieties" A "species" may embrace many distinct "varieties," and man has indeed been able to produce artificially many varieties of existing species. But it is always nec-

essary to *maintain* by artificial means the modifications thus produced, else the individuals speedily revert to the original ancestral condition. Thus, upon consideration of these modifications of type, it is found that, so far from lending any support to the theory of Evolution, they furnish a strong argument against it. For it is essential to that theory that modifications, when of advantage to the possessor, *should become fixed* in the family, and be *carried forward* to all succeeding generations. But what we find in actual experience is just the reverse.

Moreover, while *varieties* without number can be easily produced, it has been found impossible, even in a single instance, to cross the line of *species*. Thus, we see many varieties of dog. The canine species includes the great shaggy St. Bernard, and the diminutive smooth skinned terrier. But in every case it is a *dog*, and is recognized by his fellow dogs as such. No amount of breeding, or cross-breeding, could ever make him anything but a dog.

Indeed it is demonstrable that *the species are absolutely fixed;* and that so far from there being a general tendency on the part of all animate creatures to depart from the ancestral type, there is, on the contrary, found to be an invariable and inexorable law, which absolutely forbids such departure. Since we regard this fact as fatal to the Darwinian theory of the origin of species, we will give the explanation of it in the words of a famous evolutionist, Mr. Huxley, who says:

> "If you breed from the male and female of the same race, you of course have offspring of the like kind; and if you make the offspring breed together, you obtain the same result; and if you breed from these again, you will still have the same kind of offspring. There is no check. But if you take members

> of two distinct species, however similar they may be to each other, and make them breed together, *you will find a check.* If you cross two such species, then, although you may get offspring in the case of the first cross, yet if you attempt to breed from the products of that crossing (which are what are called *hybrids*) that is, if you mate a male and a female hybrid, then the result is that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred you will get no offspring at all."

We need not inquire the explanation of this, though Mr. Huxley says, "the reason is quite obvious in some cases"; for the fact is admitted on all hands.

Now what, we would ask, is the inference to be drawn from this fact? Certainly it follows that the evolution of one species from another is an impossibility; so that, at this point again, the theory breaks down completely. Indeed we can read as much between the lines of the admission which Mr. Huxley himself is constrained, though with manifest reluctance, to make. He says:

> "After much consideration, and assuredly with no bias against Mr. Darwin's views, it is our clear conviction that, as the evidence stands, it is not absolutely proven that a group of animals, having all the characters exhibited by 'species' in nature, *has ever been originated by selection, whether artificial or natural."* And again; "Our acceptance of the Darwinian hypothesis must be provisional so long as *one link in the chain of evidence is wanting;* and so long as all the animals and plants certainly produced by selective breeding from a common stock are fertile only with one another, that link will be wanting."

Later on Mr. Huxley definitely rejected the Darwinian theory, as we will point out hereafter.

Reproduction We have referred in the foregoing pages to the power, inherent in all living creatures, to *reproduce their kind.* This universal fact, which obviously is essential to the continuance of every species, raises the important question, *how did the power of reproduction originate?* It is evident that *the very first* (as well as all subsequent) organisms must have possessed this marvellous power. Whence then did it come? Manifestly it could not have arisen by a gradual process of Evolution; for the very first organisms must have had it in the same perfection as their offspring. Here again the doctrine of Creation appears to great advantage in comparison with the defective theory of Evolution; for, as a prominent part of the inspired description of Creation, are the words: "Grass, and herb *yielding seed after his kind*" etc. Those words fully account for the power of reproduction possessed by all living creatures.

In concluding under this heading we want to say that it would suffice to put the case for Evolution entirely out of court that there should be found no evidence sufficient in character and amount to establish it. But the case against it is far stronger than that. For even those who give no weight to the testimony of the Bible on this point, have to admit that there are no observable tendencies on the part of any one of the billions of living creatures to depart from the ancestral type, but that, *per contra,* where variations have been produced artificially, they are but slight in character, and the tendency is invariably to go *backward* and not *forward.* This is a strong *dis*proof of Evolution.

CHAPTER III

Science not an Authority

In this chapter we propose to examine the reasons usually advanced in support of the theory of Evolution. Those reasons relate entirely to *Organic* Evolution, or the Origin of Species and the "Descent of Man"; for there is (so far as we are aware), no pretence that any facts are known from which the theory of *Cosmic* Evolution could be inferred.

It should be pointed out, before entering upon this examination, that it is easy to impose upon the majority of people by an appeal to "Science" as an authority. Thus, we often hear it said, "Science has discovered this," or "Science tells us that," as if the matter were thereby conclusively settled. But it would be well to ask, who is "Science"? and where does he live? And how comes he to know these things? The fact is there is no "Science" in this sense. It is true that a few capable men have attempted to explore the field of Nature in various directions, and have ascertained a fact or two, to which they have added a thousand guesses. But they have left a million questions unanswered, without which no safe conclusions can be drawn. It is the commonest thing for "Science" to contradict one day what it most positively asserted the day previous; so that, in view of the existing state of *complete scientific ignorance* on the subject of *origins,* it would be absurd to accept as true any statement on that subject in the name of "Science."

A few years ago Mr. Thomas A. Edison, commenting upon the boasted progress of Science, said that if the same rate of progress were maintained for the next *two thousand years,* mankind might then be in a position to begin to draw conclusions.

Reasons Given in Support of Evolution In examining the reasons that are commonly given in support of the theory, we shall select those which are deemed, by its advocates, to be the strongest. These are (1) the changes which are observed to occur in the embryo of the human species from its first beginning to its full development, which changes are assumed to be, in their order and character, a recapitulation of the changes through which the species itself is supposed to have passed in the course of its development; (2) the succession of living forms in time; it having been ascertained from geological researches, that the more simple forms of life are, generally speaking, found in the lower strata of rocks, and those more complex higher up.

Embryology We put this argument first because (a) it is generally deemed the strongest, and (b) it is from out of the studies of changes in the embryo (*embryology*) that the idea of Evolution sprang. So we have now the opportunity to examine the theory at its point of origin.

The argument from embryology consists of two suppositions, for neither of which is there any proof whatever. *First* it is assumed that the human species *did* evolve by gradual changes, passing from a simple uni-cellular creature, such as the Amoeba, through successively higher species until it became Man; and *second,* it is assumed that the human embryo passes through *the same changes* in its prenatal history of about nine months. Manifestly we have here no proof of Evolution; for in this argument, Evolution is *taken for granted.* It cannot be possibly known whether the changes of the embryo *are* a resumé of the history of development of the species, until it is known *what that history was.* Therefore we are thrown back upon the question, can Evolution be certainly inferred from the changes of the embryo?

First let it be observed that there is no proved or necessary relationship between the growth of the embryo and the history of its species. If indeed the embryo does perform, in the short space of nine months, the stupendous feat of changing from Amoeba to Man, passing swiftly through all the intervening species, it would be a most miraculous and supernatural thing, whereof it were vain to seek an explanation in the sphere of nature. Evolution, however, is exceedingly *slow*. It demands millions of years to effect slight changes. It denies and excludes the miraculous from the sphere of nature. It cannot, therefore, assume a prodigious miracle in its own support. The supposed transformations of the embryo tend not in the slightest to prove the truth of the theory. Those changes, like all others in the history of a living creature, belong in the category of the mysteries of life, concerning which science has been able thus far to give no explanation whatever. "The way of the tree of life" (Gen. 3:24) has been effectually kept from all prying investigators.

But let us go deeper into the subject, and ask, what *are* the changes which take place in the human embryo? And do they really constitute an evolution? Upon pressing this inquiry we find *first*, that the likeness of the human embryo to that of other creatures at different stages of its growth is a mere *superficial* resemblance; for even the evolutionist would not pretend that there is any *essential* likeness between them; and *second*, that even in those superficial and transient resemblances the growth of the embryo *does not* go through the stages of the supposed development of man. These objections are fatal.

1. In a case of this sort, superficial resemblances count for nothing; for beneath them there are, in fact, *vital* differences. The human embryo is, at all stages of its growth, the *human* embryo. It is at every stage, essentially different from that of the worm, the

fish, and from that of every other mammal. Prof. Fairhurst says:

> "It is evident that while all eggs, from that of the sponge to that of man, may *seem* to be alike in structure, they are really as far apart in their *essential nature* as are the fully developed sponge and the full-grown man. Taking the embryos of man and fish the argument of the evolutionist is as follows: The embryos of man and fish, at a certain stage of development, are closely alike in appearance; therefore, man and fish had a common ancestral origin. The conclusion which the evolutionist draws is based upon a mere seeming and very transient resemblance, while the fact that the two embryos are *essentially unlike* is shown by the vast distance apart at which they arrive by development. It is true that the *embryos* of vertebrates *look* much more alike than do *the adults,* and that the *eggs* are still nearer alike *in appearance* than are the *embryos;* but I insist again that the embryos are no nearer together in *essential structure* than the adults. The egg which can be developed into a man is just as different in nature from the egg of a fish, as the man is from the fish. The eggs are essentially unlike. The essential qualities of eggs are beyond the power of the microscope to reveal. The human embryo is produced *by human beings only;* and whatever may be its miscroscopic appearance, it is at every stage of its development *strictly human.* Embryology, as applied to Evolution, fails in that it deals only with *the surface of things.*"

Thus the strongest argument of the evolutionist breaks down completely for the reason that the facts are the reverse of what his theory calls for.

2. Furthermore, even the superficial changes of

the human embryo do not represent anything like the *complete* line of the supposed human ancestry. Prof. Fairhurst says that the entire first half of the history of Evolution is not even hinted at in the epitome (*Organic Evolution Considered,* p. 147). Further he says:

> "There are radical differences between the embryos of vertebrates and invertebrates. Worms and other articulates in embryo lie doubled *backwards* around the yolk, while all vertebrates are doubled *in the opposite direction.* According to the theory that the embryonic condition is a recapitulation of the stages of organic evolution, this fundamental fact of invertebrate embryology ought to have been preserved by the vertebrate. Evolution gives no account of this reversal of position by the vertebrates."

There are other gaps in the succession of changes through which the embryo passes; but it is needless to speak of them. Enough has been said to show that the argument from embryology is not only a far-fetched inference, but that the facts are the reverse of what the inference calls for.

It is of interest to note that Dr. Romanes, one of the most extreme of evolutionists, declared the facts of embryology to be "the most important of the lines of evidence" in support of Evolution. While holding those views he wrote strongly against the Bible doctrine of Creation, and against supernaturalism in general. "But later he changed his views entirely, and died in 1894, confessing his faith, not only in the providence of God, but in the deity of Christ." (Fairhurst: *Theistic Evolution,* p. 11.)

Succession of Species The evolutionist also appeals, in support of his theory, to the fact that the fossils preserved in the sedimentary rocks indicate that the various species did not come into exist-

ence all at once, but successively; and that (generally speaking) the simpler forms came first into existence, and the more complex later in point of time.

To this argument the obvious answer is that the fact of the successive appearance of the several species does not tend in the least to prove that the later were derived from the earlier by a process of evolution, or by any other process. The succession of the species can be explained by Creation, as well as by Evolution. In fact the record of Creation in Genesis 1, declares that vegetation first appeared on earth, then fishes, then birds, then land animals, and finally Man. The geological remains show the same order. Manifestly then the argument from succession of species lends no support whatever to the theory we are discussing.

But we can go further than this; for when the details of the geological records, as presented by the science of paleontology, are examined, it is found that they bear heavily *against* the theory. This is conceded by the very foremost evolutionists, insomuch that, to escape the force of the paleontological proofs, they are driven to the pitiful expedient of supposing that there have been millions of extinct species and transitional forms which have left no trace of their existence, and that if by any means the lost evidence could be recovered, it would prove their case.

The fact is that an enormous mass of evidence has been accumulated by means of geological researches. Here we have the foot-prints of the distant past, the records of the periods which would certainly be *rich* in the evidences of the evolutionary origin of the various species, if such were indeed the nature of their beginning. The evolutionist examines this great mass of facts and finds *nothing* which supports his theory, but much to the contrary. His only comment on the situation is that Nature has, with invidious discrimination, destroyed the great bulk of the evidence, including *every trace of the operation of Evolution,* and

every one of the thousand billion variant forms which must have existed, and has preserved *only such evidences,* and those in great abundance, *as oppose his theory.* It may be said of this explanation that it is even harder to understand and to accept than that which it purports to explain—the absence of all trace of a "law" which is said to have operated *universally* and from the very beginning of time. The great god, Evolution, is indeed as difficult to locate or find a trace of as the Olympian Zeus.

Imagine a litigant in court upon whom rests the burden of proof. He insists that the averments of his declaration are true, and demands a verdict in his favor; but he has *no proofs to sustain his allegations.* In fact all the evidence presented in court is against him. He demands, nevertheless, that judgment be rendered in his favor upon the supposition (a) that volumes of proofs, which once existed, have been destroyed, leaving no trace; and (b) that if those proofs could now be produced they would be found to be in his favor! Such is the absurd plight in which the theory of Evolution now finds itself, as matters stand at present.

As to this important feature of the discussion it is enough to say that, considering the great mass of fossilized remains which have been collected from every stratum, and from every part of the world, the presumption is that, if the records were complete, the parts now missing would confirm what we have.

Species Appeared Suddenly

The first fossil remains of organisms are found in the Primordial period. Le Conte says that in it are found "the representatives of all the great types of animals, except the vertebrates." Thus, according to the evidence (which, by Le Conte's statement, is massive in quantity and clear in character), numerous highly organized creatures—about *half the entire animal king-*

dom in fact—came suddenly and virtually simultaneously into existence. Of their supposed progenitors, of whom, if Evolution be true, countless billions must have existed, not a trace survives in the earlier formations. This is the more impressive because those earlier formations are estimated to have occupied *about half the entire period of geological time.*

(In this discussion we are giving the evolutionist the advantage of supposing, for the purpose of the argument, that his theory of immense ages of geological time is correct. That theory is, in fact, quite destitute of supporting proof, and we wish it to be understood that we do not accept it as true.)

Great Gaps Between Species Existed From the First

Another very striking fact which this earliest record of living creatures presents is that, "*from the very beginning* the great gulfs which separate the animal kingdom into sub-kingdoms and classes existed then, and have continued till the present time" (Fairhurst). Considering that the interval from the Primordial period until now is estimated by physicists at fifty millions of years, we have in this fact of stability of the species a conclusive proof that Evolution is a myth.

Another striking fact, to which these records bear witness, and which is fatal to the theory, is that every species, as it suddenly appears, has its *complete organism;* that is to say, it is fully developed in every feature of its structure, however complex.

If, therefore, we place ourselves in imagination in the Primordial period, amidst the immense number of varieties of living creatures then existent, whether we look backward into the past, or forward into the future, we see that Evolution had nothing whatever to do with their origin or development. In one direction we see no long ancestral line from which they were gradually evolved; for the species, like each in-

dividual member thereof, came into being *suddenly.* This may be termed "negative" evidence. But such evidence is sometimes conclusive, as when a thorough exploration of an island reveals no remains whatever of man or human implements, it may be concluded with certainty that it was never inhabited by man.

But on looking *forward* the evidence is *positive,* as well as conclusive. For the very same species found in the Primordial era, and appearing suddenly, are in existence today *without substantial change of structure or habit of life.* Evolution requires, and of course would produce, life-forms quite *flexible* and *plastic,* structures such that every part of every organ and surface would be liable at all times to variation, and would be subject to change whenever a change of environment occurs. But we find, on the contrary, *absolute rigidity* of both structure and habit. On this evidence we are bound to conclude that living creatures originated in a manner very different from that assumed by the evolutionist.

As has been already stated, the earliest geological remains of organisms show lower and higher forms of life *existing side by side.* Now, according to Evolution, the former would be the progenitors of the latter; and upon that supposition there must have been already at that early period an immense evolutionary advance, which would imply that such lower forms were *exceedingly progressive* in character. But this supposition (and with it the entire theory) is completely negatived by the fact that *those self-same forms have persisted without change to this very day.* Instead of being progressive, as Evolution demands, they are proven to be *absolutely unprogressive.* Every one of those million forms is a venerable witness (50 million years old, if our geologists are right) against the theory of Evolution.

What reply has the evolutionist to these facts?

Worse than none. Mr. Huxley, one of the ablest of them all, and one who openly devoted his great talents to the destruction of faith in Divine revelation, has faced these facts in his address to the Royal Geological Society in 1870. He puts the question thus:

> "What then does an impartial survey of the positively ascertained truths of paleontology testify in relation to the common doctrines of progressive modification (*i. e.* Evolution), which suppose that modification to have taken place from more to less embryonic forms, from more to less generalized types, within the limits of the period represented by the fossiliferous rocks?" And he answers the question by saying, "I reply, *it negatives those doctrines;* for it either shows us no evidence of such modifications, or it demonstrates such modification as has occurred to have been very slight. The significance of *persistent types,* and the small amount of change which has taken place even in those forms which can be shown to have been modified, becomes *greater and greater* in my eyes, the longer I occupy myself with the Biology of the past" (quoted by Th. Graebner, in *"Evolution"*).

The Fragmentary Character of the Record

The disappointed evolutionist pleads the imperfection of the geological records. In order that his theory may not be dismissed for lack of proof, he asks us to believe that much of the pertinent evidence has been lost, and that what has been lost was *in favor of his theory.* But Le Conte says: "We think the fragmentariness of the geological record has been overstated." And the Duke of Argyll, in his *Organic Evolution Cross-Examined,* shows conclusively that, in certain periods, the plea of imperfection of the record is completely ruled out.

"There are," says he, "some tracts of time regarding which our records are as complete as we could desire. In the Jurassic rocks we have a continuous and undisturbed series of long and tranquil deposits, containing a complete record of all the new forms of life which were introduced during those ages of oceanic life. And those ages were as a fact long enough to see not only a thick (1300 feet) mass of deposit, but also *the first appearance of hundreds of new species.* These are all as definite and distinct from each other as are existing species. No less than 1850 new species have been counted, *all of them suddenly born,* all of them lasting only for a time, and all of them in their turn superseded by still newer forms. There is no sign of mixture or of confusion, or of infinitesimal, or of intermediate variations. These 'Medals of Creation' are all, each of them, struck by a *new die,* which never failed to impress itself on the plastic materials of this truly *creative* work."

Could it be shown that but only *one* species originated otherwise than by slight modification of the structure of pre-existent species, that would suffice to overthrow the theory of Evolution. But the science of paleontology presents us with clear evidences of thousands of species coming suddenly into existence; and on the other hand there is not the faintest indication that there was ever a species that came into being in any other way.

We have, therefore, found that what evolutionists put forward as the strongest proofs of their theory—Embryology and Paleontology—yield, when closely examined, convincing, indeed conclusive, evidence against it.

CHAPTER IV

Specific Objections to Evolution

Evolution undertakes to account for every part of every living organism, by progressive modifications caused by resident forces. Hence it is not an exaggeration to say that every organ and member of every living creature supplies us with an objection to Organic Evolution. Our difficulty, therefore, is not for lack of illustrations, but rather which to select from the number available. Several out of the many at our disposal will suffice to show how completely the theory breaks down, when we leave the realm of vague generalities and bring it to the test of concrete facts.

Before applying this test we should perhaps state that, according to the Darwinian theory, every organ was evolved from what was originally a very slight variation (due to accident or other cause unknown), which variation, *because it proved useful to its possessor,* was transmitted to its offspring; and it is supposed that the departure continued through many generations until at last it became an organ—such as an eye, an ear, a wing, with a distinct and valuable function. Thus "Natural Selection" attempts to account for *the preservation* of certain variations from the original stock, but *not for their production.* The main point of the doctrine is that *only* such accidental variations are preserved as are *advantageous* to their possessor. We cannot state the theory more definitely because its authors themselves are utterly unable to suggest *how* Natural Selection worked in any concrete case—as, for example, in evolving the wings of fowls and insects. Mr. Darwin says: "Our ignorance of the laws of variation is profound. Not in one case out of a hundred can we pretend to assign

any reason why this or that part has varied." Thus we are left, as Prof. Fairhurst says, "in almost total darkness as to the cause of the most important factor in Organic Evolution."

The evolutionist leaves us to think out for ourselves how the limitless number of diversities of organs, members, instincts, etc., in all the millions of living species, came into being. We see in all of them specific organs upon which their existence or welfare depends. Natural Selection tells us that, at a time far back in the past, their ancestors had *none of those organs,* not even those that are vital. But it does not, nor does it attempt to, trace the development of a single organ, or tell us what the intermediate creatures were like, or how they lived during the long stretches of years during which those *vital* organs were being evolved. The question is: How did many generations of species live without organs whose functions are vital? That is a hard question even for an evolutionist.

Here then we are in a position to state an objection to which, so far as we are aware, no reply has ever been made. It is this: Inasmuch as the evolution of an organ, such as the wing of a fowl, would require many centuries of time, and many generations from parent to offspring to bring it to a useful stage of development, how is it possible to account for its preservation during the long period when it was an undeveloped and *useless* appendage? Natural Selection purports to account for the preservation only of such variations as are *useful* to the possessor in "the struggle for existence." The facts of nature force that limitation upon the theory, inasmuch as the existing organs and members are such as are of some use or advantage. The theory cannot admit of the perpetuation of useless organs and structural features, for such do not exist. But, upon looking closely at the matter, we perceive that every organ—such as an arm, an eye,

an ear—however advantageous *when fully developed,* must have been preceded (if the theory be true) by an exceedingly long period during which it would have been not merely useless, but often a positive *dis*-advantage. It follows that Natural Selection, by its own necessary limitations, cannot account for the development of any organ which must needs pass through a period of non-usefulness. Hence the theory breaks down completely.

The Wings of Fowls Consider, for example, the wing of a fowl (an illustration used most effectively by Prof. Luther T. Townsend, and quoted in Dr. Leander S. Keyser's *Contending for the Faith*). Here is a very highly organized structure, certainly most important to its possessor. It is a wonder of design, and the very perfection of workmanship in every detail, down to the tiniest feature of the smallest feather. Whether we regard the design, or the construction, or the material, we see perfection in each and all. But we find on the back of every bird not one wing, but two, *practically identical in every feature.* Moreover, they are symmetrically placed, and in the most advantageous position for the purpose for which, upon the theory of Creation, we should say they were *intended.* But, according to Evolution, those wings must have been developed each quite independently of the other, from what was at first an accidental hump or protuberance on the back of a featherless reptile. They must, moreover, have been perpetuated, with steadily progressive development, keeping pace with one another, through the progeny of countless generations, during all of which time, these unnatural excrescences would be, not an advantage, but decidedly an encumbrance to their possessors. But this *could not go on* under the "law" of Natural Selection; for that "law" tolerates only the fostering of *useful* variations. Hence Natural Selection would

quickly destroy such variations. But conversely the wings of the fowl destroy Natural Selection. Evolution cannot account for wings, either by Natural Selection or by any other supposed method of working. Many able evolutionists have admitted this (Herbert Spencer among them); yet they cling to Evolution, notwithstanding the impossibility of proposing a method by which it could work. Is it because they cannot bear the alternative of recognizing Creation and the Creator?

The Bat and the Mole

We would cite in this connection the instructive case of the bat, quoting from Prof. Th. Graebner: "The bat," says he, "is another highly specialized animal.

"In many respects it resembles the mole; but its hands are enormously expanded, and the exceedingly long fingers are connected by a soft membrane, making a most serviceable wing. Is it not extremely likely, assuming the development theory to be true, that the mole and the bat sprang from a common ancestor? And was not that ancestor probably a wingless mammal? How then came the bat to acquire his wings? Did he attempt to spring into the air to seize a passing insect, reaching out his fore-paws to catch it? And did those paws gradually become enlarged until, after some generations, they became real wings? If so, what happened in the meantime to those connecting links whose wings were but partly developed? A bat *with wings only half grown* would be a helpless creature, and would surely perish. There is no middle ground. If the ancestor of the bat was a terrestrial creature, with limbs fitted for walking, then it must have given birth to a full-fledged bat, fitted for flying. There could have been no middle stage;

for such a creature would have been helpless and must have perished.

"All this applies with equal force to the diversified and often highly complex structure of plants. As the organs of the various plants are now constituted they serve most admirably their respective purposes. Given a slight change, an undevelopment, and the individual would perish. But such undeveloped stages must necessarily have occurred in the history of *every life-form on earth,* if a change through slow adaptations is to be accepted as an hypothesis to account for their present form. To our mind this matter of rudimentary structures presents an insuperable obstacle to acceptance of the evolutionary hypothesis, even on scientific grounds."

We have thus far considered only the subject of wings, seeking to imagine how those wonderful organs, so vital to their possessors, could have been evolved. But manifestly whatever organ or member, external or internal, of whatever creature we might select, it would be equally impossible to trace any line of development for it, whether by Natural Selection or any other method of Evolution that has been proposed. It is obvious that humps, excrescences and other abnormalities, are *blemishes;* and the more they might be developed, short of acquiring a new function (as sight, hearing, flying) they would be a great *dis*advantage to their possessors. Such abnormalities, moreover, *do not tend to reappear in offspring.* On the contrary they tend to disappear. A whole race of men have practiced the rite of circumcision for nearly four thousand years, and at the same time have refrained from outside marriages; yet never was a child born already circumcised.

If, however, the perpetuation of such abnormalities were indeed the law of nature, then there would

be *no recognizable species.* All individuals would be undergoing changes, both internal and external. In such case we should see humps, protuberances and the like, on various parts of different creatures, in various stages of progress towards whatever chance, or "resident forces," might ultimately determine—legs, arms, wings, horns, tails, trunks, tusks, or some other and novel sort of organs or members, of the nature whereof we could form no idea in advance of their complete development. That is what we *would* see if Evolution were true. If then we see nothing of the sort, it is because Evolution is a delusion.

It is appropriate also to ask, when, under the supposed process of Evolution, would a developing organ or member reach completion? How would the "resident forces" know when to stop its progress? Could it ever be said, in any case, that an organ was *finished?* Would not progressive changes be *always* taking place in *every part* of *every* organism? Certainly, if the world of living creatures were indeed left to the blind control of unintelligent "resident forces," it would be a world of more vagaries, monstrosities and abnormalities, than was ever pictured by a delirious brain, or by the disordered imagination of an opium eater.

The Water Spider Let us now consider the case of the water spider, and ask ourselves if there be any conceivable way in which its peculiar organs, instincts, and manner of life, could have been derived, by Evolution, from others of the spider family.

Like other spiders the water spider is an air-breathing animal, yet, unlike other spiders, it *lives under water.* How did it evolve the extraordinary changes in its organism, and in its habits of life, whereby it acquired *first,* its set purpose to live under water; and *second,* its special organs and instincts whereby it is enabled to give effect to that strange

purpose, and to live, thrive, and rear its young in such an unnatural environment?

Of course, if the water spider was *always* a water spider, and was, by its Creator, endowed with just the organs and instincts that are suited to the manner of life appointed to it, the matter is very simple and intelligible. But we are inquiring how the water spider and its ways could have come about through Evolution. Surely those who press that theory upon their fellow-mortals, and who ask them to cast aside the belief in Creation and the Creator—with all that that involves—should at least be required to tell us *how* Evolution worked, or *could have worked* in such a case. Was ever such a thing heard of, as that we should be asked to believe, *on the ground of "reason" and "Science,"* in a thing so preposterously *un*reasonable that the imagination can conceive of no possible way in which it could be accomplished?

Upon examining the water spider, and acquainting ourselves with its ways, we find that its body is covered with hairs in such a way that it does not become wet when in contact with water. In order to live under water, and rear its young there, it must construct a water-proof cell, capable of containing enough air for breathing purposes; it must have means for renewing the supply of air from time to time; and it must have the instincts to guide it in the performance of these necessary operations. And we may confidently add that *the very first* water spider must have been fully equipped for the purposes indicated. It spins under the water an egg-shaped envelope, open underneath for entrance and egress. This envelope, which is *water-proof,* is securely attached to some object so that it will remain submerged. Having constructed its house, the little creature next proceeds to fill it with air. For this necessary operation its hind legs are covered with hair and are so constructed that they can take hold of a large bubble of air, and carry it

down into the water, and to the opening of its house. There the air is released, and it rises to the top of the envelope, expelling the corresponding quantity of water. This operation is repeated until the cell is sufficiently filled with air. The eggs are then laid in the upper part of this house and are surrounded by a cocoon.

It is manifest that this extraordinary manner of life, and the highly specialized organs, which are vital to it, could not possibly be the outcome of a long and slow process of development. Before the life of a water spider could even begin, it *must be* equipped with, *first,* the means for secreting a water-proof material; *second,* means for spinning that material into a water-tight cell; *third,* protective hairs to keep it from becoming wet; *fourth,* the peculiar apparatus for filling its house with air; *fifth,* the several instincts which prompt the doing of these remarkable things.

That there is no trace of the evolution of the water spider (or of any other creature) is reason enough why the theory should be rejected. But we confidently submit that the facts briefly set forth above, and the conclusions which necessarily follow from them, constitute proof positive that Evolution is not only an impossibility, but an absurdity.

Spiders in General The subject of the origin of *instincts* will be further considered under our next heading. But while we have before us the subject of spiders, the following from Orton's Zoology will be of interest:

> "Spiders are provided at the posterior end with two or three pairs of appendages called *spinnerets,* which are homologous with legs. The office of the spinnerets is to reel out the silk from the silk-glands, the tip being perforated by a myriad of little tubes, through which the silk escapes in excessively fine threads. An ordinary

thread, just visible to the naked eye, is *the union of a thousand or more of these delicate streams of silk.* These primary threads are drawn out and united by the hind legs."

Here we find a marvellous co-ordination of special organs: (1) the *silk-glands,* capable of secreting a fluid which has the remarkable property of hardening upon exposure to the air; (2) *spinnerets,* having each more than a thousand perforations of microscopic size, without which the silk-glands would be worse than useless; (3) *hind legs,* having the wonderful function of forming the thousands of invisible filaments into a thread, without which function both glands and spinnerets would be a serious detriment to their possessor. It is simply impossible that these three organs should have developed gradually, and *independently of each other,* to the stage of perfection, in advance of which stage they could not co-operate in the slightest degree to the one end for which they all exist.

Let it be noted that, if the spinnerets had but *one* aperture, or *a dozen,* or even *a hundred,* the liquid material would not have the required area of exposure to the air to effect that *instant* solidification which is *absolutely essential* to the success of the entire operation. It required *at least a thousand* apertures to produce the desired result. Who knew, or could have known, the need of such a number of orifices? or could have formed them in a tube the size of a spider's leg? And in what imaginable way could several *legs,* intended for *locomotion,* be evolved into organs so radically different in function? It is not too much to say that those thousands of orifices are just so many witnesses that Evolution is a huge delusion, which has made foolish the wisdom of the wise, and has exposed to deserved ridicule the gullibility of the brightest minds.

Organs and Instincts: The Bee-Hive

The difficulty of tracing a line of development along which any known organism could have come into being, or any of its special members or parts could have originated, is immensely increased when we take into consideration a highly specialized creature, such as the honey-bee, which is also endowed with unique *instincts* requiring for their exercise a corresponding unique structural organization. In such case the theory has to account, not only for the evolution of an exceedingly complicated mechanism, but also for the simultaneous development of equally complicated instincts, dependent upon that very mechanism, and impossible of being obeyed without it. And it has further to account for the preservation of both mechanism and instincts through the long era of inutility. And—to add one impossibility to another—we have here a case in which, not the life of the individual only but that of the entire community depends upon the exercise of those instincts and the functioning of that mechanism. *Where and what were the honey-bees during the centuries of time which Natural Selection would require for the evolution of those instincts and their necessary mechanism?* Evolution attempts not to give an answer.

But the difficulties in this case have not yet been fully stated; for in the swarm of bees we find three distinct classes—queens, workers and drones. Each of these classes is absolutely necessary to the life of the swarm, and each has structural peculiarities and instincts radically different from the other two. The workers, which are undeveloped females, constitute the largest and most important class. Their organic structure is highly specialized to fit them for the many and various operations they have to perform; and their instincts are correspondingly complex. How and from what could such a marvellously specialized creature have been evolved? The evolutionist can

give no answer that is worthy of a moment's notice. But the wonder of this largest and most important class of the bee-community is that, both in organization and in instinct, they are *diverse from both their parents;* for they are the offspring of queens and drones. It is vital to the theory of Evolution that the characteristics of parents should pass to their offspring. But here is a highly organized creature which has an organic structure and a complex set of instincts *possessed by neither of its parents!* Whence then comes the honey-bee? It does not transmit its wonderful characters to its offspring, for it has none. And if a worker-bee should lay an egg (as occasionally happens) the offspring is invariably a drone. Clearly then, the worker bees are not the product of Evolution; and their existence and renewal from generation to generation, from parents *unlike themselves,* is a standing contradiction to Evolution.

The Beaver Prof. Fairhurst, in his able work already quoted, (*Organic Evolution Considered*) calls attention to the remarkable example of instinct manifested by the beaver. We quote:

> "It lives in communities and constructs dams, sometimes as long as *three hundred yards,* stretching across shallow streams of water. These dams are built of sticks of wood, generally about three feet long and six or seven inches in diameter, which the animal cuts with its teeth. The sticks are put in the water and are held in position by means of mud, stones and moss, which are placed upon them. The dams are *ten or twelve feet thick at the base;* and when the streams are wide the dams are made *to curve upstream against the current,* thus producing a structure better able to resist the force of the stream. The amount of labor necessary to construct a large dam is enormous. Moreover, it requires an incredible num-

ber of logs of wood, and great skill in engineering.

"Near the dams the beavers build their houses. Each house is about seven feet in diameter in the interior, and three feet high in the center. The walls are of great thickness. Each lodge is large enough to accommodate five or six beavers.

"The outside is plastered with mud and carefully smoothed; and the mud is renewed each year in order to keep the house in good repair. All the houses of the colony are surrounded by a ditch which contains water; and each lodge is connected by a passage-way with the ditch.

"As a supply of food for the winter, the beavers store up a large number of logs under the water, the bark of which they consume.

"Thus we find in this case an organized community, working for the common good, both in constructing the dam and the ditch, and also in storing up food; and then making special preparation for living in small groups by constructing their lodges and connecting them with the ditch.

"Here we see highly developed instincts which look to the future good of the organism. The building of the dam, the digging of the ditch, the storing of the food, are *all done to meet future emergencies.* It is evident that the construction of the dam could not have been evolved gradually, for a dam *must be of sufficient extent to be useful* ere Natural Selection could act.

"Are we to presume that beavers experimented for countless generations, thereby building up the instinct which leads them to construct the dam? If so, upon what ground can we explain the preservation of the incipient instinct until sufficiently developed to be of practical use? In what way could they have known *in advance* that a dam would serve their good? Shall we assume that their instinct led them, in the first instance, to

construct a dam, they not having had any experience whereby an instinct of that kind could be evolved? If the instinct existed *without having been developed by experience,* then we cannot account for it by Evolution''—And we may interrupt our quotation to say that the instinct *must have* existed in advance of the building of the first dam, else obviously it would never have been built. ''If evolved, then we must assume that the first dam made was of sufficient use to give its makers an advantage in the struggle for existence, and that the instinct which led to its construction was transmitted to their offspring.

''Manifestly then, in accounting for the evolution of this instinct, we of necessity *begin* with an instinct that is *already useful;* and thus we assume the existence of that for which we are trying to account. We are obliged to assume that, in a single generation, a beaver or colony of beavers was produced, which had a *new* instinct, *sufficiently developed to enable them to build a useful dam;* and that, in consequence of this, they themselves were the better preserved; and that the instinct was transmitted to the offspring. If all this could have happened in a single generation, it is evident that no question need be raised as to the possibility of future evolution.

''Besides this, the construction of a ditch for water around the several lodges required a *different* instinct, serving another purpose. Its evolution involves similar difficulties.''

The examples considered above are not exceptional; for we could never exhaust the strange instincts of insects alone, of the origin of which it is impossible to account upon the theory of Evolution.

The question of the development of *instincts,* along with that of *special organs,* required for those pecu-

liar instincts, and in their turn utterly useless without the latter, is a question which the evolutionist is unable to face. Mr. Darwin himself says there exist "cases of instincts almost identically the same in animals so remote in the scale of nature, that we cannot account for their similarity by inheritance from a common progenitor, and consequently must believe that they were independently acquired through Natural Selection" (*Origin of Species,* p. 226).

But Mr. Darwin himself realized that, to believe a thing so utterly unreasonable, and so contrary to all known facts and experience, would require credulity of a most uncommon sort; for he said: "Many instincts are so wonderful that their development *will probably appear to the reader a difficulty sufficient to overcome my whole theory.*"

True enough. For in this we can thoroughly agree with Mr. Darwin. But inasmuch as Mr. Darwin was evidently himself aware of the incredibility of his theory, we wonder how he could expect others to accept it. What the whole extraordinary situation demonstrates most conclusively is, that there is no mind so capable of believing the incredible, as that which is pleased to call itself "the scientific mind," and that there is no person in the world so irrational as the "rationalist."

CHAPTER V

The Origin of Man

Of all the questions of *origin* that of *Man* is supremely important, and if, as we doubt not is the case, the doctrine of Evolution was inspired by the great "Spirit of Error," as a special effort in these last days to "blind the minds of them that believe not," then we may well conclude that his main object would be to discredit statements of Scripture which relate to the creation of Man. The words, "Let Us make man, in *Our* image, after *Our* likeness" (Gen. 1:26), reveal a truth of fundamental importance. Against this foundation truth of Scripture (which is closely linked to that of Redemption by Him Who came in the likeness of Man) Evolution raises the monstrous and impious fiction that Man was made in the image and likeness of the ape, by means of an unbroken continuity of changes imperceptibly small.

If the explanation of the origin of *Instincts* presented difficulties which Evolution finds insurmountable, what shall we say of those powers and endowments of mind and spirit which distinguish *human beings,* and which mark the existence of a mighty chasm, deep and wide, between the highest of the brutes and the lowest of the human race! For it is not in his physical being, his *body,* that the special characteristics of man are to be found. Physically he is far inferior in strength and activity to many brutes. His bodily resemblance to the largest of the apes is seen at a glance; but that resemblance is superficial, and is easily accounted for, consistently with the truth of Creation. For, since Man has a physical being, and requires organs for locomotion, sight, hearing, manipulation, etc., in common with other ani-

mals, his *physical* makeup would, of course, resemble theirs in respect to those organs, with only such modifications as would be required by the differences in his physical manner of life.

The Characteristics of Man

The differences—immeasurably great—between the brute and the man *lie beneath the surface,* and have their existence in the regions of the *soul* and *spirit,* regions which, though so manifestly *real,* are yet *so mysterious* that even Man himself has no means to explore them, nor words to describe the simplest of their mysteries. In Man we find a creature who is self-conscious, who can reflect, reason, contemplate; who has the power of abstraction; who can comprehend general ideas; who can arrange his thoughts; who can communicate them to others by oral and written language; who has a sense of beauty; ability to enjoy harmonies of sound or color; a perception of right and wrong; a conscience; and above all, who has *a capacity to know God.* How vast are these differences! Who can declare their breadth and depth? Who would, unless infatuated by some mysterious delusion, or possessed by the spirit of mischievous error, compare with the chattering ape a being of whom even Charles Darwin says that he can "follow out a train of metaphysical reasoning, or solve a mathematical problem, or reflect on God, or admire a grand natural scene"?

"Missing Links"

The very *lowest type* of human being has all these marvellous capabilities in common with the highest. Between the two extremes there are infinite gradations, merging one into the other, in such a way that not a line the thickness of hair could be drawn at any part of the scale. But, when we reach the lowest limit in that scale, and look from that point to the *very highest* of the brute

creation, it is not across a mere "break in the chain of continuity" that we are looking, but across *an immeasurable chasm.* There is much talk about "the missing link." But such talk is nonsensical. Moreover, it obscures the facts of the case; for it is not a mere "link" that is missing, but ten thousand times ten thousand links. There is *nothing* in all the animal creation which answers to the mental, moral and spiritual nature of Man; or to his power of verbal expression of thought; *nothing* from which those marvellous and godlike attributes and powers could conceivably be derived by Evolution.

The low moral standing of savages does not lend support to Mr. Darwin's theory, though he appeals to it; for the lowest of them possesses a *capacity for morals,* as well as the most highly cultivated of men. According to Natural Selection, says Prof. Fairhurst, "Savages ought not to have *any* capacities except those that have been constantly in use, and that have been preserved because they have *proved* useful." But savages have, in common with all men, natural powers which enable them to appreciate moral distinctions, and to receive instruction in regard thereto, and to make progress in education in all directions.

It is related of Mr. Darwin that "When he sailed past certain islands in the Pacific, he found them inhabited by cannibals; but twenty-five years thereafter he found those very islanders converted to Christianity and enjoying the blessings of civilization. How many millions of years would it take," can any evolutionist tell us, "to convert a tribe of gorillas into God-fearing, man-loving, self-conscious beings, capable of believing that they possessed immortal souls," and that they were the objects of God's redeeming love and saving grace? (Fairhurst: *Organic Evolution Considered.*)

What these facts of common knowledge prove is that all men are *akin to each other;* that all are in

common endowed with attributes God-like in character, bestowed from above, not derived from beneath; that they are wholly distinct from the brute creation; that by sin the moral nature of Man has been ruined; but that Man, *in his most degraded condition,* is capable of being regenerated and renewed under the potent influence of the Gospel of Christ. Thus, the pertinent facts of common knowledge, which are universal and the same in all the centuries of our era, are *in perfect agreement with the statements of Scripture concerning the Creation, the fall, and the recovery of Man through Divine intervention, and are utterly opposed to Evolution.*

Ancient Human Remains We would deem it a waste of time to discuss in detail the human bones, found in various localities, and which have been put forward by the evolutionist—hard pressed for proof—as being the remains of a type of Man somewhat nearer to the ape *physically,* than any now living. It suffices to say that the actual character of such fragmentary remains is, in all cases, more or less a matter of speculation; and that not a single human skull or other bone has ever been discovered that differs in any marked degree from corresponding parts of human beings now living. Furthermore, we have shown that the real problem of the evolutionist is, not to account for Man's *physical* being by Evolution (impossible as that is) but to account for the origin of his *mental, moral and spiritual attributes* which are his real distinguishing characteristics. As to those, the facts all bear witness that Evolution is a monstrous delusion—doubtless a phase of that "strong deluson," to which, according to the prophetic Scriptures, they of the last days were to be given over, who "received not the love of the truth that they might be saved" (2 Thess. 2:10-12). It will suf-

fice, on this branch of our subject, to quote a few passages from recognized authorities.

The great Virchow, one of the very greatest of chemists, an investigator and anatomist of the first rank, says:

> "We must really acknowledge that there is *a complete absence of any fossil type of a lower stage in the development of Man.* Nay, if we gather together all the fossil men hitherto found, and put them parallel with those of the present time, we can decidedly pronounce that there are among living men a *much greater proportion* of individuals who show a relatively inferior type, than there are among the fossils known up to this time."

Honest evolutionists will not dispute this. Thus, the "Engis skull," found in Belgium, and gleefully hailed as that of the much sought "missing link," was conceded by Prof. Huxley to be "a fair average skull, which *might have belonged to a philosopher,* or might have contained the thoughtless brain of a savage." This Engis skull is supposed to be *the oldest known up to now.*

Again quoting Prof. Virchow:

> "We seek in vain for the missing link. There exists a definite barrier separating man from the animal, a barrier which has not yet been effaced—heredity, which transmits to children the faculties of the parents.
>
> "It was generally believed a few years ago that there existed a few human races which still remained in the (supposed) primitive inferior condition of their organization. But all these races have been the objects of minute investigation, and we know that *they have an organization like ours,* often indeed *superior to that of the supposed higher races.* Thus, the Eskimo head, and the head of

the Terra del Fuegians, belong to the perfected types. All the researches undertaken with the aim of finding continuity in progressive development have been without result. There exists no man-monkey and *the* 'connecting link' remains a phantom."

The above quotations are as given in Th. Graebner's work "Evolution: An Investigation and a Criticism," from which we also quote the following:

"No one has stated ascertained facts touching the origin of Man more succinctly and more clearly than Prof. Dr. Friedrich Pfaff, professor of natural science in the University of Erlangen. He shows conclusively that the age of man is comparatively brief, extending only to a few thousand years; that man appeared suddenly; that the most ancient man known to us is not essentially different from the now living man, and that transitions from ape to man, or from man to ape are nowhere to be found. The conclusion he reaches is that the Scriptural account of Man, which is one and self-consistent throughout, is true; that God made Man in His own image, fitted for fellowship with Himself, a state from which Man indeed has fallen, *but to which restoration is possible through Him Who is the brightness of His Father's glory, and the express image of His Person.*"

CHAPTER VI

Theistic Evolution A "theist" is one who believes in a God, "theism" being simply the opposite of "atheism." A Mohammedan is a theist. Hence "Theistic Evolution" signifies the acceptance of the theory in a form which does not deny the existence of God. As a matter of fact, the term "Theistic Evolution" is little more than a name. Those who have brought forward and have popularized the doctrine of Evolution are not in the least concerned about "Theism." Their aim has ever been to abolish God altogether, or at least (since a "First Cause" is essential to the theory) to deprive Him of all personality and attributes, and to banish Him to the remotest confines of time and space.

Much less are evolutionists concerned about *Christianity,* except to antagonize its vital truths. Evolution was put forth as an anti-christian and infidel doctrine; and for fifty years it has supplied the platform from which, and the weapons with which, Christianity has been assailed. Haeckel, the infidel naturalist, termed Darwin's *Origin of Species* the "Anti-Genesis," and exultingly proclaimed that "With a single stroke Darwin has annihilated the dogma of creation." This antagonism between Evolution and Christianity is a fact which, we suppose, no sincere evolutionist would deny.

Nevertheless, there has arisen in recent years a large class of theologians who, while choosing to call themselves "Christians," nevertheless accept and advocate the doctrine of Evolution. These have attempted to effect a compromise between the two irreconcilable systems, and to that compromise they have been pleased to give the name "Theistic Evolution."

They would hold to Evolution as a general cosmic process, but would put it under the control and supervision of God, and would allow of Divine intervention by direct action at those stages which evolutionists find it particularly hard to get over. They would allow just so much "Theism" as seems necessary to help Evolution over the hard places. But inasmuch as this compromise permits enough Divine action in the affairs of the universe to destroy the theory of Evolution, as set forth by the responsible exponents thereof, we may dismiss "Theistic Evolution" as a mere verbal expression to which there is, and can be, no corresponding reality. True evolutionists would not recognize such a self-contradiction as "Theistic Evolution."

In this connection we quote further from Prof. Fairhurst:

> "The first great evolutionists, beginning with Darwin, and including Huxley, Spencer, Tyndall and others, based the theory of evolution on matter, motion, and force. It was purely a system of naturalism, that did not recognize God, nor the Bible, nor what the Christian regards specially as the supernatural."
>
> "No cosmic evolutionist can accept a miracle at any point of the natural process. To him a miracle as a part of Evolution would be unthinkable."

Thomas Huxley speaks quite as plainly as Haeckel, saying: "Not only do I hold it to be proven that the story of the Deluge is a pure fiction; but I have no hesitation in affirming the same thing of the story of the Creation."

According to Herbert Spencer nothing is known of God except that He is "unknowable." If this is not practically the same as denying the existence of God, it would not be easy to say wherein the difference lies. If there be a Supreme Being, and He is "unknow-

able," then it must be either because He has not the power to make Himself known, or because He has not given to the highest of His creatures the capacity to know Him. The first supposition is disposed of by the consideration that, if God did not have the power to reveal Himself and to create beings capable of knowing Him, He would not *be* God. And the alternative is disposed of by the fact that Man *actually possesses* the faculty of reflecting upon God, that he has a consciousness of God, and that he has the ability to understand communications from others equal or superior to himself in the scale of being.

Mr. Spencer dogmatically asserts that "the deepest, widest, and most certain of all facts" is this, namely, "that the Power which the Universe manifests to us is utterly inscrutable" (*First Principles,* p. 46). This is, for all practical purposes, pure atheism. It asserts that there is no revelation from God, and *can be none.* It is, however, an assertion of the most reckless sort, which has absolutely nothing to back it up except Mr. Spencer's spiritual blindness and deadness. It has no more weight or authority than would attach to the assertion of a blind man that the deepest, widest, and most certain of all facts is that *total darkness* is the universal and perpetual state of nature. That a man may be in complete ignorance of God is evident enough; but that one should make his own ignorance the ground of denying the possibility of knowing God is simply to add colossal presumption to total ignorance.

It requires no great penetration to see that the real object of attack by the supporters of Evolution is the Bible, with its revelation of Christ as the Redeemer and Saviour of men. It matters little or nothing whether a perishing child of Adam believes in the existence of God or not, so long as he is blinded to the one thing which most concerns him to know, and that is *the salvation of God,* which the Bible reveals,

and which is received by all who believe "the testimony that God gave of His Son."

That Evolution serves most effectually to blind the minds of all who accept it to the facts of sin and Redemption is undeniable. Therefore the pretence, masked by the term "Theistic Evolution," that the doctrine can be reconciled with the truth of Christianity, is merely an attempt to make it more successfully destructive, by throwing incautious people off their guard. There is *not a single deadly heresy,* among all that were, in past generations, *openly* opposed to the faith of Jesus Christ, which has not now succeeded, by one means or another, in entering into and establishing itself within the precincts of professing Christendom, and which is not, in our day, openly preached and taught in the "churches" and theological seminaries.

When the main features of the present state of Christendom, as briefly outlined above, are understood, there will be, as Prof. Graebner has well said, "no need to inquire why, on the one hand, enemies of the Bible in all ranks of life *greeted with such joyous acclaim the principle announced by Darwin,* and why, on the other hand, a chief purpose of Christian apologetics has become the demonstration that Christianity is justified *even by reason* in that view of the origin of the world which it inculcates, and that, on the other hand, *the evolutionary hypothesis is contradicted by the facts of religion, of history, and of natural science.*"

The spread of the doctrine of Evolution has been phenomenal. Therefore, many theologians became alarmed, "because they thought that 'Science' had succeeded in proving that all things were produced by Evolution. They began to consider how they could reconcile theology and 'Science.' They imagined that Evolution was an established science. They said: 'We will change the lion into a lamb by chang-

ing its name.' And so they called it 'Theistic Evolution,' but accepted the agnostic or atheistic *method,* and then began to sleep comfortably over their wisdom (?)" (Fairhurst).

It is indeed a fact that those "Christians" who have thus surrendered to infidel Evolution have done little more than devise a name.

Evolution and Christianity Between Evolution and Christianity there is and can be nothing but the sharpest antagonism. Prof. Fairhurst well says, "Christian evolution is inconceivable."

Christianity is based upon the fact that the Bible is a Divine revelation. But the Bible, according to Evolution, is itself but a detail of the cosmic process. Here is an issue as to which reconciliation is impossible. One cannot hold Evolution, and also hold the Christian view—which is Christ's own view—of the Holy Scriptures. If the Bible is from God, if every Scripture is God-breathed, if holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, then Evolution is false, and its author is that father of lies, whose chief aim is to "deceive the nations" and to "blind the minds of them that believe not."

One of the best known writers of our day, Mr. H. G. Wells—himself a thorough-going evolutionist—has lately declared in print that Civilization owes both its *origin* and its *preservation until now,* to the Bible, saying: "It is the Book that has held together the fabric of western civilization"; it has "unified and kept together great masses of people"; and in fact "the civilization we possess could not have *come into existence* and could not have *been sustained* without it." And Mr. Wells drives his point to its logical conclusion by showing that, without something to take effectively the place of the Bible, civilization will speedily be overthrown.

This frank admission involves, if true, the complete negation of Evolution. For, according to that theory, the Bible should be the product of Civilization, and man's ever-advancing Progress should be continually producing, by slight variations, better and better Bibles. But here is an evolutionist who forgets his doctrine long enough to declare that the Bible produced Civilization, and not Civilization the Bible. Here then, in that ancient Book, which is forever correcting and improving man, but which receives no correction or improvement from man, we have a complete disproof of Evolution. What we here assert is, not merely that the *statements contained in the Bible* contradict the doctrine of Evolution, but that *the very existence and persistence of the Bible,* in its place of undisputed supremacy among books (a place it holds despite the most strenuous efforts to dislodge it); the hold it establishes upon the hearts and consciences of men; the stupendous and morally excellent influence it has exerted upon the lives of individuals and the prosperity of communities; constitutes a proof of the most convincing sort that Evolution is a monstrous falsehood. If Evolution were true, the history of the Bible, with its place and influence among men, would have been an impossibility. Hence *the existence of the Bible is a disproof of Evolution.*

The Law and the Gospel Not Evolved

The law of Moses, with the peculiar economy based thereon, and the peculiar people associated therewith—the Israelites—were not the product of Evolution. The children of Israel came out of Egypt *utterly unorganized,* having lived there for centuries in slavery, dominated by an idolatrous and polytheistic race. At the time of their departure from Egypt they had neither laws, government, worship nor organization. Yet they entered Canaan forty

years later with a law, statutes and judgments, and a system of monotheistic worship, utterly unlike anything previously existing in the world. The miracles recorded in the books of Moses explain what otherwise would be inexplicable. Judaism is a complete refutation of the theory we are discussing.

But if the Jews, and their laws, institutions and worship cannot be accounted for by Evolution, still more impossible is it to account for Christians and Christianity by that theory. Christianity was not the product of Evolution. There were no "resident forces" in the world leading gradually up to it; no progress towards it; but just the reverse; for everything was going rapidly in the opposite direction. Judaism had departed completely from the spirit and teaching of the law and the prophets. Greek advancement in literature, philosophy and art had eventuated in a puerile system of polytheism, and in extreme moral degradation; while Roman progress in the art of government had produced atheism and unspeakable corruption and decay in morals. Christianity arose, not only *utterly different* in every feature from its environment, but *in deadly antagonism to the tenets of Jews, Greeks, and Romans.* Christianity, considered merely as an *historic fact,* in connection with its environment, destroys Evolution down to the ground. There is but one conceivable explanation of Christianity, and of the people who "were called 'Christians' first at Antioch," and that explanation is *Christ;* the Christ of the Gospels, born of a virgin; the Word made flesh and dwelling among men, as Immanuel, God-with-us; Christ crucified, and Christ risen from the dead; "Christ the power of God, and the Wisdom of God" (1 Cor. 1:24).

Evolution and Christ To say that Jesus Christ was evolved, that He was the product of His environment, is both to repudiate Christianity, and also to reject the plainest facts of history.

Here we reach the climax of the matter. Christ is "the Truth"; and the conclusive test of every doctrine and every system is to bring it into the presence of Christ. When subjected to that test, Evolution fades into nothingness like the mists in the presence of the sun. The resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead was not an evolution. It was a *complete reversal* of the course of nature. The people who are "quickened together with Christ" are not an evolution, but a "new creation."

Here again we quote a striking passage from Prof. Graebner.

> "We cannot leave this subject without briefly adverting to a great historic fact, indeed the most massive and significant fact in all history, which, in its more remote bearings, not only strikes at the very root of evolutionistic philosophy, but at the same time wounds it mortally in all its parts. I refer to *the Resurrection of our Lord.*
>
> "The resurrection of Jesus Christ is the central fact of our Christian faith; and it is, when rightly understood, the all-sufficient answer to the theory of Evolution.
>
> "Christ's resurrection is an *historical fact,* fully as much as the defeat of Xerxes at Salamis in 480 B. C., the discovery of America by Columbus in 1492, and the peace of Versailles of 1919 are historical facts, proven by the word and record of contemporary witnesses.
>
> "But, if Christ was raised, then we have proof for the following tenets, all contradicting evolutionary speculation at so many vital points: (1) The existence of a Personal God, Who is concerned with human affairs; (2) The reality of miraculous interference with natural forces; (3) The truth of atonement and redemption; and

(4) The inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures (hence also of the creation account in Genesis). The details of the argument are beyond the scope of this paper; but a little patient study will bring to light the fact that each of these four basic ideas is dovetailed, mortised and anchored so firmly in the fact of Christ's resurrection, that you can get rid of them only by denying that fact. Hence it is, aside from any investigation of proofs of Evolution, clear to the Christian student that there must be some fault either in reason or in observation that vitiates the whole theory. The resurrection of Christ is a fact, to which the entire history of Christianity bears witness, the most tremendous fact in the history of the world. And it stands four-square against a theory which says that there is no personal God, no sin, no redemption; that there are no miracles, no revelation, no inspiration; that there is no absolute religion, and no absolute standard of right and wrong."

The supreme disproof of Evolution then is *the Risen Christ*, and the results which have everywhere followed the preaching of the Risen Christ.

CHAPTER VII

Estimates of Darwinism

The Darwinian doctrine of Natural Selection has been discarded by Spencer, Huxley, and other leading evolutionists, who thus leave the theory of Evolution, as it were, suspended in mid-air, without any method whereby it could work. Mr. Darwin himself had serious misgivings as to his theory, and never regarded it as established.

We consider that the abandonment of Natural Selection must logically involve the abandonment of the entire doctrine of Organic Evolution. It is appropriate, therefore, to make brief reference to the very general repudiation in recent years of the Darwinian concept.

Dr. E. Dennert's book *At the Death-bed of Darwinism* gives the testimonies of leading scientists, showing that the title given to his book is fully justified.

Prof. Luther T. Townsend has also written on *The Collapse of Evolution,* giving testimonies of prominent men of science to the same effect.

St. George Mivart (University College, Kensington, England) says: "With regard to the conception as put forward by Mr. Darwin, I cannot truly characterize it except by an epithet which I employ with great reluctance. I weigh my words, and have present to my mind the many distinguished naturalists who have accepted the notion, and yet I cannot call it anything but *a puerile hypothesis.*"

Prof. Fleischmann of Erlangen, who once accepted Darwinism, but after further investigation repudiated it, says: "The Darwinian theory of descent has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of nature.

It is not the result of scientific research, but is purely the product of the imagination."

Prof. Haeckel, a most extreme evolutionist, bewails the fact that he is left standing almost alone. He says: "Most modern investigators of science have come to the conclusion that the doctrine of Evolution, and particularly Darwinism, is an error, and cannot be maintained." And he gives an impressive list of "bold and talented scientists" who, he admits, have abandoned the theory of Darwin, though at one time they advocated it. This admission by one of the most noted infidel evolutionists is important. A house thus sharply divided against itself cannot stand.

Dr. Gotte has published an instructive history of Darwinism, showing the stages through which it has passed, from its enthusiastic reception down to its final stage "when its days will evidently soon be numbered."

Edward von Hartman also shows that Darwinism has passed through four stages, and says that the opposition has now "swelled into a great chorus of voices, aiming at the overthrow of the Darwinian theory. *In the first decade of the twentieth century it has become apparent that the days of Darwinism are numbered";* and he gives the names of eminent scientists who are "among its latest opponents."

Prof. Joseph Le Conte, of the University of California, says: "The evidence of geology today is that species seem to come into existence *suddenly*, and in *full perfection*, remain substantially unchanged during the term of their existence, and pass away in full perfection. Other species take their places apparently by *substitution*, not by *transmutation.*"

Dr. Robert Watts says: "The record of the rocks knows nothing of the evolution of a higher form from a lower form. . . . Both nature and revelation proclaim it as an inviolable law, that *like produces like.*"

Dr. J. B. Warren, of the University of California,

said recently: "If the theory of Evolution be true, then, during the many thousands of years covered in whole or in part by present human knowledge, *there would certainly be known at least a few instances of the evolution of one species from another.* No such instance *is known.*"

Prof. Owen declares that "no instance of change of one species into another has ever been recorded by man."

George Ticknor Curtis, in a recent book, *Creation or Evolution,* says: "The whole doctrine of the development of distinct species out of other species makes demands upon our credulity which are irreconcilable with those principles by which we regulate, or ought to regulate, our acceptance of any new matter of belief."

Prof. Dana, in his Manual of Geology, says: "Science has no explanation of the origin of life. The living organism, instead of being a product of physical forces, *controls those forces for its higher forms, functions and purposes.* Its introduction was the grandest event in the world's early history."

Lord Kelvin, the very foremost of English scientists in his day, in an address delivered in 1903, said: "Forty years ago I asked Liebig, walking somewhere in the country, if he believed that the grass and flowers which we saw around us grew by mere chance force. He answered, 'No; no more than I believe that a book of botany could grow by mere chemical force. . . . . It is not in dead matter that men live and move, and have their being; but in a creative and directive Power, which science compels us to accept as an article of faith. Is there anything *so absurd* as to believe that a number of atoms, by falling together of their own accord, could make a crystal, a microbe, or a living animal?' "

There is nothing so reasonable as *faith.* For faith is simply the acceptance of *the testimony of God,*

given to men in "the Scriptures of truth," which have proved themselves, in their history and influence in the world, to be super-human. Conversely, there is nothing more unreasonable than unbelief; for it denies not only the light of Divine revelation, but that of nature (Rom. 1:20; Acts 14:15-17; 17:24-29). Small wonder is it that men who vaunt the human intellect and who have rejected the word of the Lord, should be so fatuously credulous as to attribute designing skill and creative power to a mere concourse of atoms.

The same Lord Kelvin, whom we have just quoted, is on record as declaring that, *there is not a single ascertained fact of science which conflicts with any statement of the Bible.*

When, therefore, we hear, as is common enough nowadays, assertions made by unbelieving theologians and others, to the effect that "science" has shown this or that statement of Scripture to be erroneous, let it be remembered that we can bring the testimony of the most eminent men of science to prove those assertions false.

Dr. Ethridge of the British Museum, a noted expert in fossilology, speaking of the views of evolutionists, says: "This Museum is full of proofs of the utter falsity of their views."

Prof. L. S. Beal, acknowledged to be in the front rank of British scientists, in an address delivered June 1903, said: "The idea of any relation between the non-living, by gradual advance of lifeless matter to the lowest forms of life, and so onward to the higher and more complex, has not the slightest evidence from any facts of any section of living nature of which anything is known."

Virchow of Berlin, regarded by some as the foremost chemist of the world, said, "It is all nonsense. It cannot be proved by science that man descended from the ape or from any other animal." He went

so far as to denounce the theory as dangerous to the state, and demanded that it be excluded from the schools.

Much more of the same sort might be added; but it will suffice to refer to Prof. Fairhurst's *Theistic Evolution* (Standard Publishing Co., Cincinnati), and Graebner's *Evolution,* already referred to, from which most of the above quotations are taken. We will only mention additionally a statement made in a very recent address (February 1922) by Prof. Wm. Bateson, the distinguished English biologist, a scientist of the first rank, who, speaking in Toronto, Canada, is reported to have said: "It is *impossible* for scientists longer to agree with Darwin's theory of the origin of the species. No explanation whatever has been offered to account for the fact that, after forty years, no evidence has been discovered to verify his genesis of species."

Surely our "liberal" theologians, who teach as truth that monstrous fiction which true men of science never regarded as more than a speculative theory, and now have, with practical unanimity, repudiated, are utterly without excuse.

The Existing Danger

Notwithstanding the fact that Darwinism is no longer believed in the circles in which it originated, its influence for harm was never so great as now. The reason is that the theory has found its way into the theological seminaries, and into the school-books of the children, where it is doing the deadly and truly devilish work of discrediting, in the eyes of many, the statements of the Word of God.

Darwinism in the Schools

A parent, writing to a religious periodical, tells of a text-book brought home by his seven-year-old boy, the title of which was "*Home Geography for Primary Grades.*" The following quotation will serve

to show what is now being taught to children of the most tender years. Discussing the subject of *birds,* this text-book for *primary* grades says: "Ever so long ago their grandfathers were *not birds at all.* Then they could not fly, for they had neither wings nor feathers. These grandfathers of our birds had four legs, a long tail, and jaws with teeth. After a time feathers grew on their bodies, and their front legs became changed for flying. These were strange looking creatures. There are none living like them now." Such are the monstrous fictions now taught to little children as scientific truth.

It is a significant and disquieting fact that a determined effort recently made in the legislature of Kentucky to forbid the teaching of Evolution in the schools of that State was defeated. Thus the arch enemy of God and men has manoeuvred this "Christian" country into the position where the accepted canons of education *forbid the teaching of the Bible to the children of the tax-payers, but permit the teaching of the most anti-Christian and unscientific doctrine that ever made a bid for public favor.*

The support for the teaching of Evolution (which in practically all cases means the utterly discredited theory of Charles Darwin) came from "educators and religious leaders" (so says the *Literary Digest*, March 25, 1922) like Lyman Abbott, Dr. Angell, President of Yale, Dr. Lowell, President of Harvard, and Dr. McFarland, Sec'y of the Federal Council of Churches.

It is high time for parents to be awakened out of sleep as to the dangers to which their children are exposed in our modern schools. These are indeed "perilous times"; and one of the greatest perils thereof is the teaching which is now being given to the young. Parents, who would be careful to keep their little ones from the dangers of the streets, recklessly expose them every day to the more serious dangers of the schools, and give themselves little concern as to what they learn there from teachers and companions.

CHAPTER VIII

Evolution in Human Affairs

We come now to a matter of deepest interest and importance; for when we turn our attention to the realm of *human affairs and activities,* we observe a state of things which is in the greatest possible contrast to what is seen elsewhere among living species. It is exceedingly important, with a view to a right understanding of the theory of Evolution, that this contrast be noted, and its significance be comprehended.

Briefly stated the contrast lies in this, that *Evolution is the method of working which prevails everywhere, and always has, in human affairs,* whereas outside of human affairs there is *not a trace of it* to be found in all the universe. By "human affairs" we mean those activities wherein man himself is the *designer* and *agent.* For there is a realm wherein man is the directing and controlling authority, wherein he has free scope to try out all his ideas, and to exert all his powers in every direction.

Man, in all his operations, and in every department of his diversified activities, is *progressive.* Other living creatures are *absolutely unprogressive.* Man develops arts, industries, social institutions, governments, etc., etc., by trying experiments, discovering defects and weaknesses, devising remedies, and so on, the changes being so rapid and so extensive that each generation lives in a different industrial, political, social and religious environment, to that of its predecessors.

In Society at large we find a typical illustration. It is one employed by Herbert Spencer. He says (*First Principles* ch. 14. Sec. 3) "In the *social organ-*

ism integrative changes are clearly and abundantly exemplified." And so beyond dispute they are. Mr. Spencer cites the development of "Society," beginning with wandering families, then tribes, then stronger tribes formed by union with or subjugation of others, until the combinations became relatively permanent, and ultimately were evolved into States and Nationalities. Nor has this progression ceased; for since Spencer's time there have been further combinations of nations, and finally a "League of Nations," which will undoubtedly eventuate in the Federation of Kingdoms, symbolically pictured as the Beast in Daniel and Revelation.

The same progression from simple and incoherent beginnings, to conditions relatively complex and coherent, may be traced *in every department* of human affairs. Whether we examine the industrial groups, the ecclesiastical, the military, the medical, the legal, etc., we find the same progressive development.

Let us consider a few illustrations of this striking law of humanity.

A few centuries ago the crudest implements served the farmer for preparing the soil and gathering his crops. From those simple beginnings have evolved the tractors, harvesters, and other modern wonders of farm-equipment; and the advance has been by slight, progressive changes. Here is Evolution sure enough, and precisely as described by Spencer and other materialists.

So likewise in the department of Locomotion and Transportation, it is easy to trace, between the wheelbarrow and ox-cart of by-gone days, and the autocar and flying machine of the twentieth century, a connected line of evolutionary progress. And a similar line may be traced from the birch-bark canoe to the Transoceanic liner and the submarine.

If we look along other industrial lines, as milling, printing, paper making, communicating intelligence

to distant points, weapons of war, etc., etc., we see the same thing, that is to say, a very crude and imperfect beginning, with a succession of forms, each an improvement upon its predecessors, and with *never an end to the development.*

Again in the literary field, we can readily trace the activity of man from a simple beginning in oral recitation and manuscript copies on vellum or papyrus, to the manifold present-day output of books, newspapers and other periodicals.

So with the religions of the world. The human element in these has undergone great and progressive changes, both in ideals and in forms and observances; and the progress still continues. Here we have again an instructive contrast; for we can readily compare the development of *the religions of the world* with the progressive Revelation of *the Truth of God.* The former follows, like everything else which is under the control of man, a strictly *evolutionary* course, every new stage involving the destruction of what preceded. The latter is, like everything that comes from God, perfect (as far as it goes) *from the start.* And, though His Revelation has been given at sundry times and in many distinct parts, yet there is not a trace of Evolution in it; for every part of God's Revelation *remains forever true;* and all the parts together unite in perfect agreement to constitute a complete and harmonious system of Truth.

It were a very easy matter to multiply our illustrations, for they lie all around us in plain view. For wherever we look within the realm of human affairs the evidences of Evolution stare us in the face. But, in striking and significant contrast with this is the fact that, the moment we pass the boundaries of that realm, we strain our eyes in vain for a scrap of evidence to indicate that the process of Evolution ever had a foothold. The birds construct their nests, the beavers their dams, the bee- and ant-colonies car-

ry on their complex operations, precisely as they always have done. Moreover, each of those creatures does its work perfectly at the very first attempt, whereas man makes innumerable failures before he can do anything even passably well.

We do not mean to say that the law of development or progress, which is seen everywhere in continuous operation in human affairs, corresponds in all respects to the "Evolution" of Darwin, Spencer, and Huxley; for there are great differences. For example, the progressive changes in human institutions are not brought about by blind "resident forces," but by the intelligent actions of men, and with a *definite purpose in view*. Nor is there a direct *organic* connection between the improved forms that are constantly springing up and the older forms which they displace. Nevertheless, the resemblance is sufficiently close *on the surface*, to make it possible for the evolutionist to draw his illustrations from the wide field of human activities; and that is the important matter we wish to press upon the attention of our readers in this chapter; for without the help of those illustrations the theory of Evolution could not possibly stand.

Evidences of Evolution in Human Affairs

In this connection there are several facts which have an important bearing on the main question, and which should therefore be carefully noted.

First, in the field where Evolution *does* operate—that is, in the realm of human enterprises, from which Spencer and others draw *all their illustrations*—the evidences of its workings abound. Traces of the earlier and cruder forms, which subsequent improvements have displaced, are plentiful. The advancement, moreover, is *not so slow* as to give the impression that things are at a standstill, but, on the contrary, is *sufficiently rapid* to permit of observation of its character and direction. From these facts it must be concluded

that, if there were any Evolution in those realms of nature which are not under the guidance and control of "the will of man," there would be abundant evidences of its workings in those spheres also. The only and the sufficient reason why things in Nature *appear* to be at a standstill, and have *so appeared* during the thousands of years they have been under man's observation, is that they *are* at a standstill. The simple and satisfactory explanation of the fact that no trace of Evolution has ever been found in Nature is, that *there has been no Evolution there.*

Second, it is seen that, in all the departments of human activities there is *never any end of development,* either in the construction of the things which man makes, or in the methods by which he operates. Never, in any part of this realm, is a stage reached where there is *rest* and *stability.* Never has the right thing, or the right method, been attained. But in Nature *all* is stable. Both structures and processes remain identically the same as they have ever been.

Why this astonishing difference? Manifestly, the reason why there is no improvement in the life-habits of the lower orders is because there *is no need of any.* Indeed, we can say there is no possibility of any. For who could improve upon the structure or materials of the honey-comb? The ways of those creatures do not change, for the simple reason that their ways, works and habits of life are *just what their Creator planned for them.*

With man it is far otherwise. The scheme of life appointed to him has been completely wrecked. His whole race is blighted and degraded. It finds itself in conditions of poverty and wretchedness. Its energies, therefore, are directed towards improvement, for the very reason that it has *fallen* from the place of life appointed for it.

But the most learned and intelligent of those who reject the light of Holy Scripture (which reveals the

truth as to man's condition, and shows that, despite all *material* gains, corruption and decay still increase and spread among the children of men) are easily misled as to the facts; and they mistake *material gains* for *true progress.*

Man's "progress," of which he loudly boasts, is a delusion. There is indeed a constant advance in mechanical inventions, and in all that contributes to a grossly materialistic industrialism. But that apparent progress serves but to hide the real facts from the many, who look only at the surface of things. In reality the civilized nations are on the down grade. Crime, insanity and suicides increase at an appalling rate. Everywhere the spirit of violence and lawlessness is rampant. In commercial life, political life and private life corruption increases and abounds.

The noted scientist, A. R. Wallace, who put forth the theory of Evolution contemporaneously with Darwin, said, shortly before his death in his ninety-first year:

> "I have come to the general conclusion that there has been no advance either in intellect or morals since the days of the earliest Egyptians. *Everything is as bad as it possibly can be.* There exist in our midst horrors and dreadful diseases never known before. Our whole social environment is rotten, full of vice and everything that is bad."

Had Mr. Wallace lived to see the conditions in the world resulting from the great European War he would have had to admit that things could be *even worse than they were then.*

The Spread of the Theory Accounted for

Finally we call attention to the pertinent fact that the presence and working of the law of Evolution in human affairs has furnished Spencer and others with such apt illustrations, and they have

used them so skilfully, that many fail to see the important fact to which we are here calling attention, namely, that the instances of Evolution to which they are able to point lie always in the realm of *human institutions.*

To this point we ask careful attention, for in it is found the explanation of what every intelligent person will ask, namely, how comes it that a theory, for which there has never been the slightest proof, but which, on the contrary, is opposed to all the facts of human observation, has met with such wide acceptance among intelligent people? The reason is that, in the field which lies *nearest to man,* and in which he can most easily observe, there *is* Evolution; not only in localities but *everywhere;* and not only occasionally but *always.* It was easy, therefore, to make the assumption that, in the more remote fields of Nature, the same law of progressive changes was in control; and the fact that "varieties" of plants and animals could be produced by artificial breeding, gave a color of support to the theory. That theory once formulated and proclaimed, it would inevitably be received exultantly by all who are biased against the truth of man's fall and depravity, and so it was sure of strong and enthusiastic support.

The Fatal Bias

On this point we quote again from Prof. Graebner:

"The warfare of philosophy against Christian faith is readily explained. Man is corrupt. He loves sin. He is conscious of his guilt and fears the penalty. Hence every avenue of escape is welcome, if only he can persuade himself that there is no God, no judgment. Man is proud, he desires no Saviour. Hence the effort to prove that no Saviour is needed, that there is no guilt attaching to sin, that there is no absolute right and wrong. Hence too the doctrine of the Agnostic that we can ascribe no attributes to God. When we read the '*Synthetic Philoso-*

phy' of Spencer we are apt to believe that the agnosticism there set forth is the result of deep philosophical speculation. Nothing could be further from the truth. Man, even cultured philosophical man, wants to have no restrictions placed upon pride and selfishness; hence it is necessary to rid the mind of the fear of Divine justice; hence the desire to demonstrate that *God has no attributes,* such as that He is *'just,'* for instance. The Psalmist describes this attitude in the words, 'Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.'

"No one who has grasped the inner motive of all 'Scientific' effort to demolish faith, can fail to understand why the many greet with such jubilant acclaim every new attack upon the Biblical narrative. No one who has pondered this motive can be snared in the net of 'science, falsely so called.' He has seen its inwardness, he knows its fatal bias."

The Law of Sin and Death

The law of Evolution then is strictly confined to *one realm,* the sphere of human affairs; and therein it has *full sway.* It is the law or rule of action of a fallen race. It is *"the law of sin and death"* (Rom 8:2). It has no place in the Kingdom of God, or in any sphere which sin has not invaded. It arises solely from man's efforts to improve his wretched condition, and from blindness to God's way of recovering and restoring His perishing human creatures.

Man, having discovered that Evolution is the rule of procedure in the realm of his own doings, has imputed the same law to his Maker, thus fulfilling the Scripture, "Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself."